January 30, 2003

Mr. Brett Bray
Motor Vehicle Division
Texas Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 2293
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2003-0635

Dear Mr. Bray:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 175776.

The Texas Department of Transportation ("TxDOT") received a request for information relating to case number 030446-02. You assert no exceptions to disclosure to most of the requested information. Therefore, we presume that you have released the information to the requestor. If you have not, you must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. However, you claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the requested information is a completed investigation and is subject to section 552.022(a) of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

- (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:
 - (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Under section 552.022, this information must be released unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Sections 552.103, 552.107. and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4-5 (1994) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.107), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111). However, you have claimed the attorney work product privilege, which is also found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure . . . are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." In re City of Georgetown, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the workproduct privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is excepted under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 (work product). Open Records Decision No. 677 at 8-9 (2002). We will therefore consider whether the submitted information is excepted under this rule.

An attorney's core work product is confidential under Rule 192.5. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under Rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Id. The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. See National Tank v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." Id. at 204. The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You inform us that TxDOT's Motor Vehicle Board must conduct an investigation whenever it has reason to believe that a violation of the Texas Motor Vehicle Commission Code¹ has occurred or is likely to occur and state that the submitted information was "prepared in anticipation of litigation or after the [department] commenced an action." We therefore find that you have satisfied the first prong of the work product test. Furthermore, we have reviewed the submitted information and conclude that a portion thereof reveals the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories in preparing to litigate the closed case. Having met both prongs of Rule 192.5, TxDOT may withhold the information we have marked in the submitted documents as attorney work product. You have not demonstrated how the remainder of the information reveals the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Therefore, TxDOT must release the remaining information.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body

¹ Tex. Occ. Code §§ 2301.001-.805.

² The submitted documents contain information that may be confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. In this instance, the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to her own information. We note, however, that should TxDOT receive another request for this same information from a person who would not have a special right of access to it, TxDOT should resubmit this same information and request another ruling.

fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Jennifer E. Berry

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 175776

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Hazel Bumpous 433 CR 4570

Winnsboro, Texas 75494

(w/o enclosures)